UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**

Who Is the Greatest Man in the World Today?

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

The Decrease of the Ministry

By T. TINKER

Book Review—"Storm in a Teacup"

By JAMES WALDO FAWCETT

VOLUME LXXXVII NUMBER 10

Chicago, May 5, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

ESTABLISHED 1878

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCES L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—
Notes.—J. H. H. 147
Abolish War!—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 149

THE PULPIT—
Who Is the Greatest Man in the World Today? Part I.—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 151

CONTRIBUTED—
The Political Outlook.—DAVID STARR JORDAN 154
The Decrease of the Ministry.—T. TINKER 155

SELECTED—
Frank Imperialism.—*Charles F. Dole* 157

A BOOK A WEEK—
Mary Badollett Powell Memorial—"Storm in a Teacup," by Eden Phillpotts.—JAMES WALDO FAWCETT 158

POETRY—
Midway.—*Charles Wharton Stork* 147
Fiat Lux.—*B. V. H. Keen* 150
The Slave.—*James Oppenheim* 153
Reconciliation.—*Siegfried Sassoon* 153
Undismayed.—DOMBEY 158

THE FIELD—
The Sixty-ninth Annual Session of the Western Unitarian Conference 159
Resolution Adopted by the Community Church, New York 159

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVII THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1921 NUMBER 10

MIDWAY.

Yon bleak and lonely crest is not for me,
  Though swathed in light from dawn till afterglow;
Not from the summit would I choose to see
  My fellow-men as pygmies far below.
I would but ask to reach a midway height
  With brooks and upland meadows all around,
Where pines should break the spears of noonday light
  And fill the void of dusk with wings of sound.

How gladly would I lend a guiding hope
  To all who pass me towards the higher places!
But gladlier would I view the plainward slope,
  The fields and cottages and upturned faces,
Beckoning all to scale a peak so nigh,
  That many men may reach as well as I.

The Freeman. —*Charles Wharton Stork.*

As speech follows message, we begin to realize what we are "in for" during the four years of Mr. Harding's administration. We wonder if anybody, at the end of this period, will be able to write a grammatically correct sentence or—what is more important!—give clear expression to an idea. The experience is particularly trying in view of the training received and the knowledge gained under Mr. Wilson's tutelage. The style of our last president, *pace* William Bayard Hale, was a model of precision, clarity and beauty. It had the further miraculous quality of being as delightful to read as to hear. It is this very fact of comparison with such an example, that makes Mr. Harding's language so appalling. The transition from the one to the other is as the fall of Lucifer from heaven. There is nothing to do, so far as we know, but to grin and bear it. But if acquaintanceship with the utterances of the president is a test of patriotism, we are afraid that there will be fewer 100 per cent patriots in America by 1925, than ever before in the entire history of the republic.

War between Panama and Costa Rica, we are told, will not be tolerated by the United States! This is good news. War between these two nations should not be tolerated. But why should war between any two nations be tolerated? Why should not the same code of law which is applied to small nations, be applied to large nations as well? Why should mere size or power bring any privilege to fight and murder and destroy? Undoubtedly the present boundary dispute between Panama and Costa Rica seems just as important to these countries as the squabble which drove Germany, France and Russia to arms in 1914, seemed to these European states. Undoubtedly, also, the issue seems to the citizens of Panama and Costa Rica to involve those high moral principles which make it sweet and glorious for men to die for their country. But the United States very properly declares all this to be tommy-rot, and, like a teacher with two recalcitrant school-boys, orders these two nations to cease their bickerings, accept the White award, and straightway behave. Would that there had been some superior power to pass similar judgment upon the silly quarrel which precipitated the Great War, and similarly order the combative nations to drop their arms and live at peace! There was no more reason why men should die for Germany and France at that time, than there is that men should die for Panama and Costa Rica today. When we organize such a superior power of international control, for great states as well as small—a kind of United States of the World!—we shall have peace—and not before!

UNITY has been slow in recognizing the action of the National League of Women Voters, at the recent Cleveland convention, in calling for a movement to end war—not as slow, however, as were the women themselves in issuing such a call! What was done so splendidly at Cleveland, under the leadership of Mrs. Catt, should have been done years ago, at the time when such action was dangerous, and for that very reason counted most. But we would not be ungracious—it is the present, not the past, which now concerns us. And that the organized women of this country are now awake, and determined to make the most of the present reaction against war, is one of the most heartening events of the day. If the women failed during the Great War, they failed only as every other class of society failed at that momentous crisis. We were all swept away by one universal moral collapse. Now the business is to recover from this disaster—and the women, thank God, are among the first to show signs of a new and resolute mind! They are moving in a way to put clergymen, educators, journalists, and even the professional peace advocates, to shame. But this is no more, after all, than we have a right to expect. For if the mothers and wives of men do not lead the revolt against war, who among us may be counted upon to do so!

Life, commenting on the German president's statement that Germany is defenseless, says, "In so far as that is true, it is Germany's great advantage; if she has no means to fight, and won't fight, she

has the public opinion of the world for her defense." We suppose that when a magazine like *Life,* which for four years howled like a gorilla for German blood, thus suddenly becomes converted to the pacifistic doctrine of non-resistance, we ought to feel elated. But we don't! We simply feel sick—sick with disgust at the arrant hypocrisy of such a spectacle. *Life* is intelligent. *Life* therefore knows that, if what it says is true of Germany today, it was true of France in 1914. It knows that, if Germany, with the vindictive Allies clutching at her throat, has her sure defense not in arms but in "the public opinion of the world," then Belgium had the same defense when the Kaiser's legions came insolently smashing across her borders. We had need of voices to cry out this divine truth, when we were in he midst of war's alarums, with all the life and happiness of humanity at stake. But *Life* kept silence; nay, worse, it "breathed threatening and slaughter," in the best spirit of ancient savagery. Now, however, with the crisis past, the exigency gone, it returns to the ways of piety, and prates of the "great advantage" of being unable and unwilling to fight, even in self-defense. We try hard to be fair in all things, but we confess that this is too much for us. We repeat, it makes us sick!

Is there no end to the hideous misery occasioned by the War and its aftermath? Will the world ever be able to foot up the total of death and misery inflicted by this calamity upon humanity? Take, for example, the story of the Nestorians of Kurdestan—a people of whom most of us have heard nothing. Before the War, these people, whose roots strike deep into the soil of early Christianity, constituted a community in the Turkish Empire of no less than 300,000 souls. Shortly after the outbreak of the War, they were ordered by the Sultan to espouse Mohammedanism and support the conflict against the Allies. This the Nestorians refused to do—whereupon they were given over to the tender mercies of the Kurds, the wild horsemen from the hills of Kurdestan; and were driven from their homes into the wilderness, where they met indescribable horrors of slaughter and rapine. They were saved from utter destruction at this time by encountering in their flight an army of Russians. Their relief, however, was only momentary, for when news arrived of the overthrow of the Czar and the establishment of the revolutionary government, these Russians at once disbanded and started for home. The Nestorians were thus again helpless before the onslaughts of their enemies, and received no protection until after the armistice, when they fell under the guardianship of Great Britain. Now in the upper Mesopotamia region there survives a miserable remnant of this great Christian community, a pitiable 18,000 women and children with a few old men, saved out of the original total of 300,000 of a happy and prosperous community. Even this remnant is threatened with extinction, for starvation and disease are, of course, afflicting them, along with millions of other homeless refugees in Europe and Asia. A Nestorian clergyman, nobly recommended, is now in this country, seeking relief funds for his people. Any readers of UNITY who may care to give their mite to this forlorn people may communicate with the Editors of this paper.

Just what happened in the great coal strike in England, is not yet apparent even at this late day. So far as we can judge, however, the collapse of the Triple Alliance on the very verge of the proposed general strike, means definitely the determination of English labor to achieve their aims by political rather than direct or economic action. What the Triple Alliance has lost, in other words, the British Labor Party has gained, although in the case of the Party also there may be temporary loss, owing to the inevitable demoralization resulting from such a fiasco as that of Friday, April 15th. The English revolution, when it comes, will come as all revolutions have come in England since the days of the Restoration—by the peaceful and orderly process of constitutional government. This is to us a welcome fact. We do not see why there should be appeal to force when the ballot is at hand—do not see where there can be found compensation for the staggering price of even a successful general strike—and cannot see wherein it is any more moral to destroy a government by attack from within than by attack from without. To starve England by a railroad and dock strike seems to us as terrible an atrocity as to starve Russia by a military blockade. It is because English labor seems to see these facts that it stands today as the most hopeful agency in the industrial revolution now impending. That the general strike was deliberately put by at the very moment when it seemed to promise most, may be taken as sure evidence not of the failure but of the success of the cause.

The Churchman (April 2nd, 1921) makes an interesting and important suggestion as to what our churches might do with those of our reactionary members who are opposed to the application of Christianity to the social problem and express their position by threatening the churches with a curtailment or withdrawal of financial support. *The Churchman* is moved to speak by the recent action of William F. Long, Vice-President and General Manager of the Employers Association of Pittsburg, who urged church members not to contribute to the Y. W. C. A., "so long as the Association (Y. W. C. A.) insisted on

upholding such social ideas as conflicted with the industrial principles of the employers of Pittsburg." Mr. Long takes the stand that the churches and religious organizations which contain "radical and Bolshevist elements" should be deliberately denied money by business men. "Religious bodies," he says, "can scarcely expect us to give them money for the purpose of manufacturing weapons for destroying industry." In other words, he wants the churches to keep their hands off in the present battle between capital and labor, regardless of the use which capital may make of its power to deny freedom and justice to the working classes of the country. In answer to the threat of this man, *The Churchman* raises the question as to whether the churches should not "right about and excommunicate Mr. Long and the Pittsburg employers, refuse to marry them, bury them, and baptize them." This certainly would be startling action, and a fit retort, it seems to us, to such an attack upon Christian social work as Mr. Long proposed. Of course, at bottom, the day of excommunication has passed by; but the time is more than ever with us when the churches should defy the commercial autocrat as they once defied the political autocrat, and vindicate afresh the supremacy of the law of Christ over the whole area of human life.

Some weeks ago UNITY published an interesting article on Church Advertising. Our author gathered and presented many specimens of "ads," but nothing in all his collection equalled one which has just been sent us by one of our readers. We reproduce it herewith:

ARE THE CHURCHES EMPTY?

Find the Answer at the
Trumball Ave. Presbyterian Church
Trumball and Brainard
Harold C. Warren, Minister
A Full House Sunday Night!
Sermon and Music Especially
For Young People

We are Here to Serve the Neighborhood!

Popular Friday Evening
Moving Picture Shows
With Feature Films.
Free Tickets of Admission—To the Friday Picture Shows given to all who attend our

Sunday Evening Services.

The intention behind this advertisement is wholly commendable. This church wants to reach the people! But think of a situation which tempts, or makes it necessary for, a church to use methods of this kind, in order to get them! Look at that device of inveigling the people to the Sunday evening services by promising them free tickets to the "movies"! One worship of God the price of a seat at a blood-and-thunder picture show! When a church gets to such a pass as this, we make no bones about saying that it ought to be closed up. If organized religion can no longer stand, except by this kind of a prop, then in God's name, let it tumble down.

Abolish War!

It would be interesting to know just what are the exact facts as regards the progress of chemical invention in the field of warfare. It is evident, from reports which are appearing these days with alarming frequency, that the governments of the world are pressing investigation and experimentation in their chemical laboratories with feverish urgency, and have now, or soon will have, in their control, various kinds of poisonous gases for use as weapons against enemies in war, deadly beyond anything that man has ever known! Thus it was formally announced in Washington a few weeks ago, that the Chemical Warfare Service had discovered a liquid poison so potent in effect that three drops, when applied to the external surface of the skin, will lead to instant death. Accompanying this proclamation of horror, was a definite illustration of what could be accomplished with this poison in case of war. "An airplane," it was stated, "carrying two tons of this deadly stuff, could cover an area one hundred (100) feet wide and seven (7) miles long, and kill every human being in that area"!

It is obvious that, in "the next war," the use of poisonous gases of various kinds, not so much against armies as against the non-combatant populations at home, will be the main feature of military operations. Indeed, this has been definitely forecasted by a British officer, who has been amusing himself lately by endorsing the German air raids against Paris and London during the Great War. With a directness matched only by what used to be repeated to us from Prussian sources in the old days, this English soldier says: "War must be carried into the enemy's country, his industries must be destroyed, his nerve centers shattered, and the morale of the nation as a whole shaken. This can largely and increasingly will be affected by air attacks on industrial and political centers."

In the next international conflict, in other words, armies and navies will count for little. Immediately upon a declaration of hostilities, the contending governments will send great fleets of airships to rain down upon non-combatants these gases which are capable of extinguishing the lives of millions of people in a period of a few hours or even minutes. Cities and towns, industrial centers, vast areas of inhab-

ited countryside, will all be wiped out upon the instant; and that nation will triumph which has surviving, after these competing downpours of "ghastly dew," some miserable remnant of gasping, blinded, tortured men and women. Such possibility seems fantastic but as a matter of fact it constitutes the grimmest reality in modern life. For the first time in history, owing to these hideous discoveries in the field of chemistry, man holds within his grasp the power to compass his own universal destruction. What has existed hitherto only as the mad dream of romancers of the type of H. G. Wells in his early years, is now become at this latter day a sober truth. We can destroy ourselves today, if we so will.

The seriousness of this situation is becoming apparent to everybody who has the faculty of facing facts and thinking upon these facts. Such persons, in sheer terror at the impending catastrophe, are beginning to urge that the use of chemical gases in warfare be forbidden by solemn agreement between the nations of the earth. This is a pious suggestion, but its fatuousness is as ridiculous as it is pathetic. For what truth has been more certainly taught us by the experience of the Great War than the truth that a country, embattled in a life and death struggle with its foes, will resort to any weapon which promises to be effective in offensive or defensive operations, whether that weapon be sanctioned or not by the laws of nations and the conscience of mankind? Once loose the passions and the fears of war, and there is no limit of horror to which belligerents will not go to compass victory and avoid defeat. As well expect to bind the winds in some secret corner of the horizon after a cyclonic disturbance, or hold the flaming lava inside the volcanic crater after an eruption, as to expect to forbid successfully the use in war of any weapons which will do the business of killing humans. And why not? For if war is permitted, why should not all weapons of war be permitted? If it is right to slaughter men in one way, why not in all ways? Why stick at the gnat of dum-dum bullets and poison gases, and swallow the camel of armed conflict as a method of settling international disputes? The business of war is the destruction of life on as large a scale and at as speedy a rate as possible. No piety is blind enough, no sentimentality stupid enough, to cover up this fact which grins hideously upon us like a naked skull. This means that the war-maker is legally justified in laying his hands on any weapon which will suit his purpose of destruction! The more horrible its character, the more complete its effectiveness, the better! To deny the war-maker his weapon, while crowning his work with glory and honor, is insanity of the first order.

What we face today is one of those supreme crises in the career of humanity, which calls for action that is as drastic as it is fundamental. Mankind has just one task before it today. Not the forbidding of this or that weapon of warfare, not the restricting of warfare to one or another mode of fighting, but *the abolition of warfare altogether!* We must put our ax at the root of the tree, and thus get rid of this "abomination of desolation" as the price of racial survival! Hitherto we have found it inconvenient, to be sure, but still possible, to live with war as an occasional diversion or horrible debauch. Now we awaken to discover that war has suddenly grown to such proportions of disaster that we can no longer hope to indulge in it at even the rarest intervals. One or the other, mankind or war, must go; the world is no longer large enough, or strong enough, to hold both.

Such proposal, of course, demands a program for the abolition of war. Our program includes the following items:

1. The formulation of international agreements denouncing war as a crime, and providing for its treatment as such.
2. The codification of international law, and provision for its interpretation.
3. The organization of an international government to supersede the independent sovereignties of existing states, after the general pattern of the federal system in the United States.
4. Disarmament.
5. The establishment of free trade.
6. The transformation of capitalism into some form of cooperative collectivism.
7. The education of men to use of the scientific method, and to service of the religious ideal.

We believe that nothing less than such a program as this will accomplish our end of abolishing war. But agreement upon these or other items of procedure, is not so important at this moment as agreement upon the task to be done, the goal to be sought. To get a program of some kind for abolishing war, to put it through and try it out, this is the only thing that is worth consideration today. We solve this question, or the end of all things is in sight!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

FIAT LUX

Let there be light; dispel the gloom,
The mournful parent of the tomb!
Come Heavenly Wisdom—cheer our way:
Transform the world of dark dismay
To prospect of Celestial bloom!

So do we pray—Time's Living Loom,
Was planned to work foul darkness' doom,
God's early edict to obey:
Let there be Light!

In all true prayer, our souls assume
Transmitting power to illume
The world with Heaven's revealing ray,
Foreboding undisputed sway,
The passion grows. Our prayer resume:
Let there be Light!

The Inquirer. —*B. V. H. Keen.*

Good manners is the art of making every reasonable person in the company easy, and to be easy ourselves.—*Jonathan Swift.*

THE PULPIT

Who Is the Greatest Man in the World Today?

A Sermon by John Haynes Holmes, Community Church of New York

I am going to speak to you this morning upon what I hope will be the interesting question as to who is the greatest man in the world today. In seeking an answer to this inquiry, I imagine that all of our minds instinctively go back to the days of the Great War, and run over the names of the men who held positions of vast responsibility and power in that stupendous conflict. Especially do we think of the great gathering of the war leaders in Paris, in the opening months of the year 1919. Two years ago, at this time, we would all of us have agreed that if the greatest man in the world was anywhere to be found, it was in this council of the premiers and statesmen of the Allied governments. These were the men who had been tested by the most awful peril which had ever threatened the civilization of the world, and who had brought out of that peril a victory which was as complete as it was sudden. Now they were being tested by the challenge of peace—by the great problem as to how to use a victory after it has been won. And it is just here, in this most rigorous of all tests, that these leaders of the nations failed. Who can say, in view of what happened at Versailles, and especially in view of what has happened since the signing of the treaty, that any one of these men responsible for the great disaster of the peace, has any substantial or permanent claims to greatness, in the true sense of the word? Of all the men who sat in that Peace Conference two years ago, there is only one, it seems to me, who still preserves a reputation that is without serious question. I refer, of course, to General Smuts, the premier of South Africa, the man of whom Mr. Walter Lippman said so vividly that, of all the peace conferees who signed the treaty in the famous Hotel of Mirrors at Versailles, he was the only one who saw mankind and not himself in the glass!

If you would know how great a man was General Smuts at the Conference, I ask you to read three immortal documents—first, his public *apologia* for the signing of the treaty; secondly, his "farewell to the people of Europe," published on the eve of his departure from London for Johannesburg; and thirdly, his noble and generous tribute to President Wilson on the latter's retirement from office on March 4 last. General Smuts fought the war with consummate ability and unfaltering idealism; in the moment of triumph on the battlefield, he sought forgiveness of the enemy, and healing of the bleeding wounds of men; in the moment of defeat in the council chamber, he confessed his failure in honesty of spirit, and sought at once to repair the damage, which he had been unable to prevent. General Smuts is a great man—the only great man who is left to us today out of the wreckage of the war. All the rest of those leaders, who filled the world for a little time with the noise of their fame, have faded, or are fading, into oblivion, never again to be restored, I believe, to the reverence of men. Ours today must be the cry of David, after the battle of Mt. Gilboa—"How are the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war perished!"

I turn away, therefore, from the storm of the Great War, and from the men who rode that storm to power and place; and I look elsewhere for that man who impresses me as the greatest man who is living in the world today. And immediately I hit upon three men, very different from one another in origin and character, who I believe may not unworthily qualify for this position.

The first man whom I would name is the Frenchman, Romain Rolland, author of that immortal novel, "Jean Christophe," pacifist exile from his native land during the Great War, the leading internationalist in this perplexing period of the aftermath of the War. Rolland is supremely great in the field not so much of achievement as of ideals. I can best indicate my estimate of him by stating that I always think of him as the true successor, in character and influence, though not of course in personality, of Leo Tolstoi, who was himself the greatest single moral influence produced during the whole course of the nineteenth century. Like Tolstoi, Romain Rolland lives a life of rigorous simplicity. Like Tolstoi, he unites a gigantic intellect with a soul of ineffable beauty and power. Like Tolstoi again, he lives and moves and has his being in that sublime realm of moral and spiritual idealism, where love is recognized as the perfect law of life, and the brotherhood of man as the fulfillment of this law upon the earth.

Before the war, Rolland was one of the few men in Europe who saw the coming of the great catastrophe, and did his utmost to prevent it. He sent out his call to poets, musicians and artists of the continent; gathered about him, as a master his students, the young and ardent souls of all countries; and strove to lead them to those heights of pure idealism in the atmosphere of which he knew it would be impossible for the prejudices and hostilities of contemporary nationalism to survive. "Jean Christophe" was written in answer not so much to artistic passion, as to a desire to interpret Germany to France, and France to Germany, and thus make clear the essential kinship between the two. With the outbreak of the War, he conceived it his unique privilege and duty to keep alive those higher instincts of the soul, which are the first to suffer in the strife of arms. Never for a moment did he deceive himself into believing that the war would purge the heart of man, or quicken it permanently to nobler impulses of devotion; on the contrary, he knew that this war, like every war, was a dirty and ugly thing, subversive of all that is pure and good in human life. Therefore did he deliberately set himself, as a priest at the altar of humanity, to guard from extinction the spirit's flame, that when the conflict was at an end, the race might not wander as one lost forever in impenetrable dark. And now, with the close of the disastrous struggle, Rolland is building anew his international fraternity, to the end of persuading men to sheath their swords, to cleanse their hearts of the poison of patriotism, and to toil for the coming of that great Kingdom of the living God which shall mean wars and rumors of wars no more.

If there is any civilization in Europe today, any light shining through the gross darkness of the present chaos, any hope for the ultimate realization of the dreams and visions which beset us of a better world, I believe this is due more truly to Romain Rolland than to Foch or Clemenceau, Lloyd George or Wood-

row Wilson, or any other of the men who struggled vainly to bring good out of the evil of the War. Rolland remained true to his ideal, served it with a flawless courage, and therewith did a work which marks him as a spiritual genius of the first order. If he falls short, as I think he does, it is in what we may term the realm of practical affairs. In this he does not fail; he simply does not enter at all. For Rolland is an artist, an intellectual, a man of the utmost sensitiveness and delicacy. It is difficult to conceive of him as dwelling among the trodden ways of men. He could never be the leader of a revolution, the moulder of great masses of the common people to a world-upheaval, the builder of the structure or the writer of the constitution of a new political and social state. Rolland, by the very necessities of his nature, as Tolstoi by the deliberate plan of his life, must move "above the battle," and not in the midst of its bloodshed and affright. For Rolland is an idealist and not a realist. I think of him as a silver star, shining resplendent above the mirk and mist of earth, a light to steer by and to worship. Others must serve as the smoky torches which show terribly the pathways of man's climbing.

The mention of the contrast between the idealist and the realist, brings me to the second name which I desire to present this morning in this discussion. I refer to the Russian, Nicolai Lenin, premier of the soviet republic, a man who wields a greater degree of personal power than any other man in the world today. In making an estimate of the position of Lenin among the great men of his time, it is necessary for us to disregard entirely such unfavorable ideas as we may chance to have of the work that he is attempting to do among his people. We may think that his principles are bad, his policies dangerous, his whole influence destructive of the best interests of civilization; but these opinions should not, and indeed cannot, affect in any way the facts as to his ability. Many people, for example, regard Napoleon Bonaparte as one of the most immoral personages that ever lived, and describe his achievements as among the most disastrous in the whole range of human history; but I have never met anybody except Mr. H. G. Wells in his "The Outline of History," who denied his consummate greatness as a man. So also with Nicolai Lenin! We may think him the vilest monster alive upon the earth today, if we so choose, but there stands the fact of his greatness all the same. This man moves among his contemporaries like a giant among pygmies. He is at the moment the center of the world's life. The affairs of the race move round his central figure like the rim and spokes of a wheel about its axle. I am not at all sure but what in future ages, this present period, which has followed upon the close of the Great War, is destined to be described by historians as the age of Lenin, just as we speak today of the age of Elizabeth or of Louis XIV.

If we would seek for evidence of the surpassing greatness of Lenin, we have only to cite the testimony of those who have seen him and studied him at close range. At first he seems to make little impression upon those who meet him, for his personal presence is evidently one of utter insignificance. He does not look like a hero, he does not walk the stride of a hero. Mr. Wells, who was as little impressed as anybody, speaks of him simply as a little man sitting behind a big desk. Bertrand Russell describes him as "very friendly, and apparently simple, entirely without a trace of hauteur. If one met him without knowing who he was, he would not guess that he was possessed of great power, and never that he was in any way eminent. I have never met a personage so destitute of self-importance." The only thing impressive about Lenin's appearance, so far as I can judge, is his head, which is that of a stupendous intellectual genius. To see the great dome of his brow, as depicted, for example, in Mrs. Clare Sheridan's bust, is to think at once of the head of Shakespeare. Aside from this single feature, however, Lenin's presence is apparently as unimpressive as his bearing is modest.

That Lenin is a great man, however, is admitted by everybody who has seen him. Arthur Ransome, who is favorably inclined toward the Bolshevist regime, declares that he is "one of the greatest personalities of his time." Bertrand Russell, who is now opposed to Bolshevism, refers to Lenin without qualification as "a great man." Raymond Robbins, who stands midway between the position of friend and foe, asserts his belief that the Soviet premier is "the greatest living statesman in Europe." Even those who view him at a distance cannot disguise their admiration. Mr. Frank Vanderlip, for example, has said that Lenin impresses him as "a man of most extraordinary ability." Nor can I refrain from quoting the opinion of the *New York Times,* which can hardly be described as friendly to the Bolshevists. Speaking at an unguarded moment, on one of the numerous occasions of Lenin's reported death, the *Times* referred to him as "the most remarkable personality brought by the world war into prominence."

What moves all these persons who have seen or studied Nicolai Lenin, to speak of him in these laudatory terms, is undoubtedly the consciousness of the stupendous things which this man has accomplished during the last three years. His deeds are almost unparalleled in history. In the first place, he has beaten back upon every front, the attacks brought against him by the enemies of Russia at home and abroad. Army after army has been organized and led against Moscow, only to be destroyed by the "red" armies fighting without resources, in a distracted country, and amid a starving population. It is the fashion these days to compare Lenin with Robespierre, Danton and Marat, the leaders of France in the bloody days of the "Reign of Terror." The true comparison, however, is with Carnot, the great war minister, who raised the levies of the Revolution, and hurled back triumphantly the invading armies of autocratic Europe.

Secondly, Lenin and his commissars have saved the civilization of Russia from the utter collapse which was threatened, and is still being threatened, as a result of the catastrophe of the Great War. This is just the opposite of what is ordinarily assumed, for most people believe that it is the advent of Bolshevism which has caused the human misery and social disintegration which are everywhere prevailing in Russia at the present time. Nothing however could be farther from the truth! The empire of the Czar collapsed of its own rottenness and decay nine months before the Bolsheviki found their way into the seats

of power. This collapse was the immediate result of the impact of the Great War, which in its end, if not in its conscious purpose, was a struggle for the destruction, and not at all for the preservation, of civilization. What happened in Russia in 1917, was only what would have happened in France had the War continued another year, and in Great Britain had it continued another four or five years. Russia simply went to pieces, because she was the least developed and most corrupt of modern capitalistic countries, and therefore the least able to bear the strain. The first revolutionary government which succeeded the Czar, tried to control the situation, but ignominiously failed. Then came Kerensky, who likewise failed. Then came Lenin, who put his mighty shoulders beneath the toppling fabric of the state, and has thus far prevented it from falling. That Russia is not today a realm of utter chaos—that its cities are not empty, its railroads streaks of rust running across vast wastes of desert country, its peoples swarming hordes of wanderers trooping madly to the west in search of food—all this is due more to Nicolai Lenin than to any other single force in the world today. If H. G. Wells is right in his surmise that the fate of Europe is identical with the fate of Russia, I venture to prophesy that the time will come when this man will be remembered not as a destroyer, but as the saviour of the social structure of civilization.

Lastly, as we survey the achievements of Lenin, we see his great constructive undertakings in the field of statesmanship. Amid unexampled confusion and difficulties, he has worked out a new formula of economic relations—communism; he has builded a new structure of social order—the soviet; he has visioned a new type of social idealism—a democracy of the workers; he has created out of abstract theory a new technique of practical achievement—the dictatorship of the proletariat.

These are the deeds of a man of the first order of practical genius. If Lenin falls short anywhere, and I am certain that he does, it is in the field of moral idealism. He seems to be absolutely devoid, not in character but in thought, of everything that we mean by ethical or spiritual principle. He boasts of the fact that he has no religion but lives contentedly in the realm of materialism. He denies that there is any such reality as a moral law to which it is proper or necessary for him to give acknowledgment. What we ordinarily describe and recognize as a system of ethics, calling for the allegiance of all right-minded people, he regards as an artificial code created by the strong, and imposed by them upon the weak for the better protection of their property and privileges. To Lenin's way of thinking, anything is right that serves the class interest of the workers; by the same token, anything is wrong that delays or hinders the emancipation of the workers. In his activities as leader of the proletariat and chief executive of the Soviet republic, Lenin acts upon exactly the same law of necessity which holds sway upon the field of battle. Like the soldier, in other words, he does anything which it is necessary to do in order to defeat the enemy and thus clinch victory for his cause. "The end justifies the means!" Lenin is seeking a great end of human redemption and social liberation; any means which are necessary for the attainment of this end, are justifiable in the period which must intervene before men are ready and able to reach the goal. It is this realist point of view of life which explains the extraordinary contradictions in Lenin's career. Thus Lenin is a democrat; but he sustains one of the most absolute tyrannies that mankind has ever known. He is not a terrorist, and yet he carried through the six weeks of the "red terror" with ruthless severity. He is not a militarist, and yet he has builded on the foundation of universal conscription, the most powerful and successful military machine in the world today. What we have in Lenin is a phenomenon which has never before appeared in history, so far as I know—a reformer of unquestioned personal integrity, rigorously pure in private character, simple and unpretentious in his ways of life, devoted to the ideal of a better world, seeking nothing for himself and everything for his fellowmen, and yet a man arrogant, autocratic, stern, hard in outline, untouched by any softness save a love for children. At bottom, there is nothing gentle or lovely about this man; he suggests only the strength of granite, and the coldness of steel. This is the reason, I take it, why Mr. Wells, when he thinks of Lenin, finds himself recalling the figure of Mohammed. Bertrand Russell, when he saw Lenin and his regime, was put in mind of Cromwell and the Puritans. I have to confess that I always think, in this connection, of Napoleon Bonaparte. All these parallels are defective—the last outrageously so; but they serve at least to reveal the realistic pattern of the man, and the stupendous order of his genius.

It is obvious that we have not yet found our greatest man. Rolland, the idealist, is defective on the side of practicality; Lenin, the realist, falls short on the side of ideality. What we need is a universal man—a man who combines in perfect balance the supreme qualities of the Frenchman and the Russian—a man who is at once an idealist and a realist, a dreamer and a doer, a prophet who sees "the heavenly vision" and, "not unfaithful to (that) vision," makes it to come true. Is there any such person living in the world? *(To be continued.)*

THE SLAVE.

They set the slave free, striking off his chains . . .
Then he was as much of a slave as ever.

He was still chained to servility,
He was still manacled to indolence and sloth,
He was still bound by fear and superstition,
By ignorance, suspicion and savagery. . . .
His slavery was not in the chains,
But in himself. . . .

They can only set free men free . . .
And there is no need of that:
Free men set themselves free.

—*James Oppenheim.*

RECONCILIATION.

When you are standing at your hero's grave,
Or near some homeless village where he died,
Remember, through your heart's rekindling pride,
The German soldiers who were loyal and brave.

Men fought like brutes; and hideous things were done;
And you have nourished hatred, harsh and blind.
But in that Golgotha perhaps you'll find
The mothers of the men who killed your son.

November, 1918. —*Siegfried Sassoon.*

CONTRIBUTED

The Political Outlook

Political parties on the European continent are mainly alliances based on common interests. Hence they are more or less impermanent and there are many of them. They form among themselves, temporary unions for definite purposes, not always connected with public welfare. The center party in most countries is composed of those upholding the state church. On the right are the reactionary groups, those who want things to remain as they are, these flanked by extremists who wish directly or through an autocratic monarchy to retain or extend their own privileges, using conscription, standing armies and nationalistic patriotism as means to this end. On the left are, first, the democrats who believe in rule by the people as the only way of abolishing privilege and securing social justice, but who realize that righteous aims are not to be reached by violence and that public welfare, education, justice and peace should be the chief purposes of government. Further to the left are groups of socialists, moderates, extremists, and at the outer verge those who would destroy the whole social order so as to begin again, regardless of the fact that good men and women, through the ages have agonized and died to secure the degree of freedom and justice we already have.

In this confusion popular government makes little headway, as if one group gains the ascendency, it is likely to be opposed by all the others, and the system by which the executive is a creature of the temporary majority tends to rapid changes of purpose, sometimes disastrous in their results.

The Anglo-Saxon people invented the more permanent fashion of a two-party system, the government on the one hand, the opposition on the other. This brings about an approach to real party government, the executive or prime minister being chosen from the parliamentary majority, passing with his cabinet out of office on the rejection by the parliament of any proposition he may put forward.

The United States accepted the tradition of two parties, their relations tempered by secessions of the dissatisfied, a means by which the two are kept practically equal in numbers with a large independent vote usually holding the balance of power.

But our fathers broke with the British theory when they gave the executive and his appointees a definite lease of power for four years, a period in which under ordinary circumstances the opposition is likely to work up a congressional majority more or less at outs with the executive.

When we consider either system, the American or the British, we are likely to see the drawbacks of the one most familiar, and to overestimate the advantages of the other. I shall not here enter on such a discussion save to say that while there are some minor adjustments which we could borrow from Great Britain, on the whole our system of fixed periods works at least as well as the party responsibility and indefinite tenure, and in view of our complex federal system, vital to the permanence of the union of states, doubtless much better.

The late election has given the Republican party the Presidency, both houses of Congress and control in most of the northern states. This is not party government in the British sense, but it throws on the Republican organization a great responsibility, the greater because its official head had given few signs of definite public policies of his own.

Parties in the United States are alliances having three types of basis—tradition, interest and opinion. In the first place, to belong to one of them is for most of us a matter of tradition. "Bromides" always vote the straight ticket and the majority of the people in every country are of this type. It is well that this is the case, for it prevents sudden changes and instantaneous transition even to better things provokes much mischief. "The mills of the gods grind slowly" when they produce any grist worth while, and violence as a rule defeats its own purpose.

In the second place one may support a political party to forward his own interests. It is for this reason that High Finance ever since the Civil War has been chiefly Republican. The Republican party was in power throughout that period. It was the party of action, the party of young men, the party which set out to do the thing that needed doing, regardless of political theory. Hence to high finance it was the party most useful for its own purpose. The Democratic party, originally the group which trusted the people and which held closest to the political theories of the founders, became entangled in the personal interests of a slave-holding oligarchy in the days when "Cotton was King." In the Civil War this party disintegrated, as all moderate or theoretical groups are sure to do in time of stress. And since then, to quote a smart saying of Hearst, "it too has worshipped the golden calf but without securing reciprocal attention from that animal." On the basis of selfish interests alone, therefore, one may choose his political party or cast his vote, and a party in power necessarily disappoints many, who will then split off, joining themselves temporarily or permanently to the opposition.

Or in the third place, political allegiance may be a matter of opinion only, giving support to the group with wisest purposes, or sometimes to the group which may be soonest brought to reason. Amid the various aberrations of both parties there are many men who have clung to their original party loyalty, in the belief that by doing so they can help to bring the party back to its moorings.

In 1888 Roosevelt told me that he had voted for Blaine, although his opinions and sympathies were with the "mugwumps" who supported Cleveland. "I can understand," he said, "how a man can work outside the party or inside, but he cannot do both. I shall always work inside the party and never undertake any policy in which I cannot count on a substantial following."

In the belief that a great party can be most effectively controlled or influenced from the inside, hundreds of thousands of progressive-minded people voted in the last election for Harding, regardless of the inconsequential utterances of their candidate, and of contradictory declamations on both sides of the question of the League of Nations. For they realize that the Democrats of both factions being certainly out of the way, the policies of the next four years will be fought out inside the Republican party. The whole range of public opinion and of personal interest

is represented there, there are problems foreign and domestic of the gravest character to be solved, bungled or dodged, and all this within the most diversified party organization ever developed in this country.

The first attempt of the Republicans is to get together, to agree wherever they can, and to postpone fighting on other matters. It is their part now to do constructive work, and of a kind to appeal to the whole country. They cannot count on war records, nor make capital out of Mr. Wilson's egocentric idealism and failures to size up men, nor of attacks on his vulnerable cabinet. They must find men the country will trust (and this includes not many of the party leaders). They must face honestly the distressing problems of deflation, taxation, reduction of expense, internationalism, immigration, prohibition, satisfactions to soldiers, recrudescence of militarism and disaffection of farmers who feel that they should not be the first victims of the hard times already long overdue. Under these conditions Governor Cox's advice to the opposition party "not to sabotage" is eminently wise. It is not for them to imitate the Republican policy of paralyzing the executive, but to co-operate with their political opponents to all ends involving national welfare, while steadfastly opposing all personal schemes and all accessions of privilege. An opposition party which maintains character and dignity may do service as important as that of a party in power and even more easily acquire popular gratitude. The welfare of this nation and largely that of the world depends on the forward look of both groups of political leaders, and on the degree to which they subordinate petty and personal interests to the great cause of co-operation and conciliation, the only method of preventing war. The choice of Hughes and Hoover as leaders in the cabinet gives large reason for hope, outweighing the feeling of discouragement which some selections for less important posts has certainly stimulated.

DAVID STARR JORDAN.

The Decrease of the Ministry

Since my childhood days I have been accustomed to hear addresses at denominational conventions and to read articles in denominational publications on "Why I entered the ministry." I do not recall ever having heard or having read a frank discussion as to why men leave, or are tempted to leave, that profession. There is not the same organized effort to retain our experienced ministers as to obtain new and inexperienced ones. The increase of the ministry barely serves to balance the decrease. Personally, I am not disposed to blame anyone in particular; officials, rank and file, ministers, laymen, all have a share in the responsibility. Of course it is understood that some men will leave because of obvious unfitness, and that some will leave because of death. But after deducting these cases, there are still many who leave because of conditions within the church which ought to be remedied. It is my purpose to set forth in this article what some of these conditions are, from information gained by experience and correspondence, with a view to arousing thought and discussion. I feel that I can well do this at present by reason of my own congenial situation and the absence of any feeling of personal resentment. Let us call my denomination the Halycon Church.

That dissatisfaction with denominational policies and conditions does exist is abundantly indicated by a number of letters upon my desk. The writers have served, on the average, fifteen years in the Halycon ministry. In reply to the question, "Are you dissatisfied with the attitude, policies or methods of the Halycon denomination?" they give such answers as, "Yes, I am," "I do not agree with the attitude, policies or methods," etc., almost unanimously.*

This dissatisfaction has caused some of them to leave the ministry and others of them to consider such a step. In some instances it seems the square thing.

> If I am not willing to head an institution dedicated to the ends the people who support the church want, should I not leave the ministry, unless I can find a church that entertains the same ideas as to the mission of the church that I have?

Others feel themselves forced out. After preaching an occasional sermon at one of our conventions a certain minister

> was corralled in the back of the church by a number of the church leaders and taken to task for talking on such subjects. . . . After A had said all the nasty things which he could think of he told me, "The Halycon Church would be a damned sight better off without you."

Another recognized leader of the church is quoted as having written that

> The Halycon Church would be better off if it kicked out all such men as B. C., Dr. D and Dr. E, that it was not looking for that brand of ministers.

Of those that are said to have left the ministry for one reason or another many feel that the work they are doing is just as much a ministry as that which they have left. One man writes:

> The fact of the case is this, I am not out of the ministry of the Halycon Church. I am simply putting into practice, on a broader scale than the . . . church permits, the principal implications of truth and principle that are basic to our faith.

It is a common feeling that, in the plans of officials, and throughout the denomination as a whole, theological victories and denominational advancement are considered more important than any really adequate program of world service.

> Our faith requires us to be consistent, sincere, and honest, in our attempts, at least, to serve humanity, instead of calling merely for the advancement of the church in numbers and financial stability. The plea of our denominational paper, with but slight modification in recent years, has been that of theological and denominational pride, and for denominational increase. It has not been a clarion call to human service. . . . It has been much the same with the messages of those who have stood in the position of denominational leadership.

> The real sociological problems are given no consideration in church life, but as Dr. F, formerly of G, said, "They are not questions in which the church is interested." When a person happens to take what is considered the radical viewpoint, he is at once hooted out of court.

> I feel that the church should have a commanding word in world problems. . . . I find it does not. . . . A Halycon Church should have a universal program. Our church has a financial and membership program, but nothing definite or inspiring.

> Sociologically, I have often in times past been heartsick that we did not move faster.

> It (the denomination) aims to keep alive but seems to have

*In this and the following quotations the names of persons, places, etc., are disguised.

lost its way. It does not know what the word Halycon means; would perhaps die sooner if it did. Its representatives are perplexed and lack courage and vision, yet are not quite so stupid and hard-hearted and hypocritical as most church officers and most churches.

Although the responsibility of the entire membership for these conditions is recognized, considerable of the blame is placed upon those who have been elected as official leaders, as lacking in statesmanlike leadership.

We have a lot of splendid preachers, but for far-seeing statesmanship and the leadership to advance splendid constructive policies of Christian service, we have been and are several years behind other denominations.

At the X convention, four years ago, Dr. Y tried to laugh out of court every resolution that was offered that dealt with social problems.

I can never feel at home in the church until our leaders have a higher standard of ethics. They seem disturbed about the Armenian children but have little thought for Russia, or Germany, or Austria, where millions died this winter.

At the close of a little chat among six or eight A happened to remark to B, "I was not at the —— convention, but from what I hear from various sources it was rather a reactionary affair." B said that such was not the case, but that there was in the church a Socialistic element, and when they would have their way he was done with the Halycon Church. He was very strong in his indictment of certain individuals, and admitted in reply to my questioning that the program was intentionally stuffed to shut out debate on the part of such fellows as C. . . . He did not want any "social program," for he said he could not find "that Jesus Christ had any social program." . . . Among other things he declared that had such a resolution as the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church passed declaring for (repeal of?) war-time restrictions on freedom of speech and press and release of conscientious objectors, been submitted he would have opposed it. Under further questioning he declared that he had never even heard of the social reconstruction program proposed by the Council of Bishops of the Catholic Church.

I would . . . immediately institute the initiative and referendum in the workings of the church.

The denominational paper, in the minds of many, is not truly representative of the various points of view to be found in the church

I believe our paper is the emptiest reservoir of applied Christianity that I read. (You see I am frank.) I told J almost as much, and he said three-fourths (of its subscribers) were old line Halyconists and that they were forced to cater to them.

I would put the publishing house or at least the paper under the immediate control of the National Convention. I would have the denominational headquarters immediately removed to Chicago.

A ground of dissatisfaction which is doubtless more familiar to laymen is the inadequate compensation of the minister. One correspondent mentions the experience of a friend:

He came to M, spent two years, with the understanding that he would be sent to N. Recently . . . he was invited to go at a salary of $25 a month.

A young man doesn't like to ask a real woman to be a minister's wife today—that is, if he has awakened to see what sort of a world he lives in.

I would insist on a living wage and organize a preachers' union and affiliate with the A. F. of L. I would have a real business proposition and cut out all perquisites.

Perhaps a more exasperating situation to the ministers themselves, however, is that which has to do with methods of changing pastorates. The first of the following quotations is from a letter from a state superintendent to a candidate; the second is from the clerk of the church under consideration to the same candidate.

I am sorry to have to say that I do not see that there is any hope for you there. It would be possible I think to get a majority of those who are entitled to vote there to vote you a call, but among many of those there would be a great deal of doubt as to the advisability of calling you. I found no real enthusiasm for your sermons.

I was present at the meeting and heard the comment by the different members. Two members of the church were opposed to your coming here. . . . The comments at the meeting were quite favorable to you and a majority vote was given for your being called. Indeed, you had some very enthusiastic friends at the meeting.

There is also the lack of any adequate method by which ministers, desiring a change of pastoral relations, can initiate this enterprise and do it with entire self-respect. Wire-pulling and practical politics enter into this matter quite as largely as they do in other departments of life, and wrongly so. My long residence in New England, and contacts with the denominational officials in Boston, as well as my observation of their activities, long ago taught me that unless one adapted the method of the social climber one could expect little notice or advancement—that had to be derived entirely from personal initiative.

I could not be trusted with a congregation of large wealth by the powers that be, or get a hearing when they were vacant, although I have never had much trouble with men who knew enough to make a fortune.

Shortly after candidating at R, Dr. S, the state superintendent, told me that I was well liked and might reasonably hope to get a call. A few days later he told my friend T that I was impossible as a candidate.

That those who have alleged grounds of complaint do not lay the entire fault upon those in prominent official positions is indicated by their descriptions of individual churches, their members and trustees.

The small-minded, selfish, unchristian, crabbed types force their will upon the organization, and unless the pastor conforms to their will, and only so long as he does this, or (what is worse) seems to, and thus placates them, can the organization keep on marking time.

Some time ago I mentioned some industrial questions with which the employing class, who make up the bulk of my congregation, agreed. It happens that I am one of those radicals who believes Labor is sometimes in the wrong. After this sermon I received many compliments, the men telling me that they were glad to see that I intended to take up the real questions of the world. . . . A while later I again tackled some industrial questions, setting forth my ideas. But this time the majority did not agree with me. Lo and behold, a minister had no right to talk on such questions. . . . One man, a trustee . . . , met me during the following week and told me that if I would continue preaching good old Bible doctrines, and would keep off the industrial questions, he would continue to support me. Otherwise he would withdraw his support and take his children from the Sunday School.

I spoke very frankly from the pulpit. While I was renovating the church and raising the drive quotas I was well liked. I had an increase . . . . in salary. . . . . But I grew more definite in my program of reform, and spoke very definitely about the implications of our ideals. This hit home to some people and caused dissatisfaction. . . . So I resigned . . . although no one ever asked me to resign or implied anything of the kind. But I felt the dissatisfaction.

Our church people feel content with things as they are with some minor changes, but are not ready to support a real progressive movement.

I have no kick—I have found in every church a minority of semi-vicious fools; a majority of well meaning people

incapable of thought; a very few thoughtful and brave. I have lost one church for telling the truth.

There are three divisions of our preaching. First there is dogmatic theology, of the Halycon type. My people do not want that kind. . . . Then there are the implications of our faith, the application of our philosophy to life. . . . But my people do not want that message. . . . There is left the historic function of the church—that of comforter, of assurance, of faith, of escape from this world, of hope in immortality. This my people always hear gladly. The first two functions of preaching they do not want. They are definite about it. *They don't want it.*

I am one of the most unpopular men in town. . . . If I preach Halyconism I am accused of stirring up trouble with the other churches; if I preach on topics of the day I am called a Bolshevist. My own people are solid for the most part but are very cowardly and fear the criticism of the other churches. . . . If I had the money I would start for California and try to make good as a movie actor.

I would insist on an occasional trial and removal of obnoxious members from the churches.

Then there is the feeling that jealousy and gossip are too commonly faults found among our ministers. Illustrations of this point are too painfully numerous to dwell upon.

I would, in the preacher's union . . . , have a ruling that if a member talked about another, he would be dropped.

The conservative, old-line members of churches, and the denominational officials who represent them, on the one hand, and the more advanced, progressive, or radical preachers, on the other hand, do not understand each other. The latter are more likely to excuse and forgive than the former. The plea of the writer is, therefore, that our more conservative people seek to sympathetically comprehend the radicalism, the social idealism, the conscientious applications of Christianty on the part of some of our mnisters, even if they cannot accept these views. Is there not room for all Liberals within the Liberal Church? Can we not rid ourselves of that spirit of bitterness which denies our gospel with a kind of theological alien and sedition law?

The decrease of the ministry would be greatly overcome:

If all church members would concede that at least a partial function of religion is to attack the social evils of this earth.

If elected leaders would give at least as much energy to suggesting organized ways of world service, as they do to campaigning for members and money.

If superintendents would be at least truthful, and if possible accurate, in their dealing with ministers and churches.

If the denominational paper openly sought to be the organ for all types of thinking among us.

If all churches would pay a living wage.

If all liberals would welcome from the pulpit honest convictions, frankly expressed.

If a more kindly spirit of fellowship prevailed among our ministers, backed by some practical plan for mutual help and encouragement.

T. Tinker.

"Whatever the world thinks, he who hath not much meditated upon God, the human mind, and the *summum bonum* may possibly make a thriving earthworm, but he will most undubitably make a sorry patriot and a sorry statesman."—*Bishop Berkeley* (1685-1758).

SELECTED

Frank Imperialism

The Boston *Herald* printed recently the final persuasive reason for paying Colombia $25,000,000. This reason, briefly, is oil. Now, we either owe this just reparation because, as Mr. Roosevelt said, we "took" Panama; or, we owe nothing. In the first case we hardly wish to offer a selfish and mercantile excuse for paying a debt of honor. In the other case, what else is the payment but the use of public money to secure advantages for special interests?

Let us keep our minds clear about what is going on in the world. The name of kaiser or dictator no longer marks the character of a government as imperialistic. We have imperialism under any form of government which is managed in the interest of a group or a part of the people with the purpose of using its power in foreign lands, specially in backward countries, so as to help the favored few to get and hold points of vantage to make money. Modern imperialism desires to procure choice concessions of oil lands and minerals for its nationals to exploit; it proposes to safeguard their ventures and their lives abroad, as if at home, and to help collect the debts due them. In fact, it means to use far more force to go abroad and fight for its favored nationals beyond seas than it dreams of using to protect its own humble people at home. Its policy includes nothing less than aggressive and acquisitive war. Thus, the United States ended the Spanish war by taking over some millions of conquered subjects.

We ought to see that the great war was imperialistic in its causes and results. France was an imperialist State as truly as Czarist Russia; England, though it worships a majority, is none the less an imperialist power than was Germany; Japan and the United States look on the island of Yap with equally imperialistic eyes. Out of a little of this imperialist friction war may be kindled. If this is what the American people really wish, of course we must have a colossal navy at whatever cost. Do they wish it?

President Harding, celebrating Patriot's day, says he will "fight for the Monroe Doctrine." The time has long since passed when anyone on this side of the Atlantic has had cause to fear a monarch of Europe coming over here to destroy democracy. The need for fear is in Washington. Our new administration has inherited a whole handful of imperialistic scandals, in Santo Domingo, Hayti, Costa Rica, in American troops garrisoning the Rhine Valley. Mexico fears us for a long story of un-neighborly conduct. In each one of these relations, and other besides, we have made a beginning to become one of the most feared and hated of nations. Our late allies are not loving us. Imperialist nations never do love one another. Did the people who voted for Mr. Harding mean to give him an imperialist mandate to fight for an imperialist Monroe Doctrine? Cannot he be helped to see the only way up and out of the quagmire—the way of national safety as well as the hope of the weary world? It is not the name of democracy, it is the reality of a friendly people, co-operating for the common welfare.

Jamaica Plain, April 20. —*Charles F. Dole.*

A Book a Week

Mary Badollett Powell Memorial

STORM IN A TEACUP. By Eden Phillpotts. New York: The Macmillan Company.

In our day good novels are not rare; there are at least twenty master novelists alive in this world this rainy spring morning—and Eden Phillpotts is one of them. If there were fewer writers or less talent there would be, I suppose, more acclaim for such a book as this "Storm in a Teacup." The reading public grows, too, I trust, and so, as there are more writers and more writing today than ever before, there must be a larger audience, and such a work as this will find enthusiastic friends.

I cannot say that this "Storm" is the finest novel I have ever read, no; I can but say that it is one of the books that I shall always treasure and keep by me. It is one of the cleanest, most dignified representations of human struggle that ever was penned in our language; of this I am certain. Eden Phillpotts is unquestionably a most able student of life and a talented artist in portraying what he observes.

The story is set in and about the little paper-making village of Dene in Devonshire, and it is the life of these Devon craftsmen that we see exposed. For paper-making Phillpotts has a great and just respect. In the final scene of the book we find these brave sentences:

> Paper stands for civilization, and the better the paper, the higher the civilization. . . . If the quality of paper goes down, that's a sure sign the quality of civilization's doing the same. By its paper you can judge a nation. . . .

No one could read this work and fail to see that the manufacture of paper is nearly if not quite the noblest of the crafts; and if there were nothing more than this to say of the book it would be enough.

Every detail of the paper process is described for us—from the sorting of the rag stock to the packing of the finished product, all the picking, boiling, rolling, drying, glazing and sorting. A "scrap of paper" has a new meaning for one who goes with Phillpotts on this fascinating journey. We see that every page has a history, a tradition and bespeaks a good workman's fond care.

The principal characters of the story are five paper makers, namely: Ned Dingle and his young wife Medora; Jordan Kellock, who had competed with Dingle for Medora's hand and, having failed, remained a friend; Lydia Tribett, Medora's widowed mother; and, finally, Philander Knox, who aspires to be Lydia's second husband.

The girl Medora is dissatisfied with the commonplace Dingle and "thinks herself fit for better things." Kellock, in the first stages of his experience with Socialist philosophy, finds his friend's wife a ready listener, and is led from point to point by the restless creature until he is persuaded to interfere in her behalf. This dangerous business leads to a bitter crisis; and, Dingle being too proud to admit a mistake, Medora represents her sufferings so vividly that Kellock agrees to run away with her to London. This elopement misses fire because of Kellock's inherent decency; and Dingle, hearing that Medora has won a "brother" and not a lover, declines to divorce her so that she may marry the saintly companion of her adventure. Medora is secretly pleased to learn of Dingle's selfishness and eventually returns to her husband and begs forgiveness. Kellock, having "lost his stroke" as a master paper maker, goes away to become a labor organizer; and Knox, who has been the confidential adviser of all the others in their many emergencies, wins the prize he so ardently coveted—the widow's hand.

There is no hero and no villain in the story. All the characters, major and minor, are flesh and blood, not straw or steel. The reader recognizes their humanity from first to last, and the whole narrative is vibrant with an absolutely flawless accuracy. These people *live;* they are not puppets.

Phillpotts might have lavished all his art on his principals, but even the secondary personages are amazingly well drawn. For example, the lazy sister-in-law of Medora's mother: a woman whose preoccupation with bearing children precludes her learning anything about how to care for them after their arrival in the world, a woman whose every thought and movement is *ponderous.* And this poor creature's husband, too, the self-sufficient old farmer, Lydia's brother, blind to everything in the world except the interests of himself, his family and his farm. Phillpotts has the genius to see these people, the patience to observe them and the talent to paint them—gray, drab, commonplace, pitiful, true to life.

But Phillpotts is no mere story maker; he is a philosopher, too, and the unknown but not unknowable power that makes the wheels of life go 'round is the subject of his thought. He is a rationalist, a man who trusts reason, but he does not under-estimate the power of crude instinct and the force of pure emotion. His plea is: *Think!*

If you have little time to read and must select your books with care, choose this rather than a less vital novel. You will come to the end of the volume with a strange feeling of having been in a social laboratory where human nature is under the microscope and where men and women are shown as neither saints nor devils but as people—as they really and truly are.

JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

UNDISMAYED.

I come to you with jewels of great price,
With offerings of gold and incense sweet,
I bring the peerless treasures of the East
To lay in loving service at your feet.

I give you food ambrosial to restore
The wasting powers that vain ambitions drain,
I hold a cup of nectar to your lips
To quench the feverish thirst for worldly gain.

The air is vibrant with pure melody
Caught from the songs of choiring seraphim,
Chanting of selfless, all-encircling love,
And joys that earthly sorrows cannot dim.

'Tis all in vain! Blind to the gifts, your gaze
Is fixed on vapory shadows, and alas!
You crave for Sodom-apples and the clang
Of tinkling cymbals and of sounding brass.

Still, undismayed, I draw eternal hope
From deathless springs within, and in my hand
Holding the key to that immortal Life,
I wait the hour when you will understand.

DOMBEY.

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

THE SIXTY-NINTH ANNUAL SESSION.

Of the Western Unitarian Conference, Lincoln Centre, Chicago, May 15, 16 and 17, 1921.

The sessions of the Conference will be held at Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard.

The headquarters for delegates will be Drexel Arms Hotel, Cottage Grove Avenue and Oakwood Boulevard, one block east of Lincoln Centre.

Sunday, May 15.

5:30-7:30 p. m.
Informal Reception in Emerson Hall Chicago Young People's League in charge.

8:00 p. m.
Inspirational Service, Annual Sermon —Frank S. C. Wicks, Indianapolis, "A Democratic Church in a Democratic State."

Monday, May 16.

10:00 a. m.
Business Session.
Welcome to Chicago—John Morris Evans, Minister All Souls Church, Chicago.
Response—Morgan Brooks, Urbana, President Western Unitarian Conference.
Report of the Treasurer—Charles B. Foote, Evanston.
Annual Message of the Secretary—Curtis W. Reese, Chicago.
Appointment of Committees.

11:00 a. m.
Address, "Religion and the New Psychology"—Frank C. Doan, Iowa City.
Address, "Religious Education and the New Psychology"—Julia N. Budlong, Kalamazoo.
Discussion.

12:30 p. m.
Meeting of the Board of Directors in Emerson Hall.

2:30 p. m.
Denominational Session.
Address—Mr. Charles L. Strong, President Unitarian Laymen's League.
Address—Miss Lucy Lowell, President National Alliance Unitarian Women.
Address—Dr. Samuel A. Eliot, President American Unitarian Association.

5:30 p. m.
Supper and Conference for Sunday School Workers—Hugh R. Orr, minister at Evanston, and Dr. Henry F. Cope of the Religious Education Association, in charge.

8:00 p. m.
Platform Meeting.
Address, "The Outlook for Industry" —Earl F. Cook, Quincy.
Address, "The Outlook for Religion" —John H. Dietrich, Minneapolis.

Tuesday, May 17.

10:00 a. m.
Business Session.
Reports of Committees, election of officers, etc.

10:30 a. m.
Address, "Experience and the Idea of God."—James W. Macdonald, Lincoln.
Address, "The Thoughtful Worshipper"—John Malick, Cincinnati.
Discussion.

12:00
Ministers' Luncheon, East Emerson Hall.
Paper, "The Value of Theism"—George R. Dodson, St. Louis.
Alliance Luncheon, West Emerson Hall.

2:30 p. m.
Alliance Session.
Addresses by Miss Lucy Lowell and Mrs. David P. Hueston.

6:30 p. m.
Annual Banquet.
Speakers: James W. Vallentyne, Unity Church, Oak Park; George E. O'Dell, Ethical Society, Grand Rapids; Laurance Plank, Dayton; Mrs. E. L. Richardson, Milwaukee; R. Ernest Aken, Louisville.

RESOLUTION.

Adopted by the Community Church of New York, On April 25, 1921.

WHEREAS, The time has come when the Community Church of New York must have a proper edifice for its work; and

WHEREAS, The investigations of the Board of Trustees since the fire on September 11, 1919, in regard to the possible disposal of our property and the finding of a new site, have disclosed the advisability of rebuilding on our present historic site on the corner of Park Avenue and 34th Street; and

WHEREAS, It is recommended by the Board of Trustees that this rebuilding shall be not a restoration of the ruined edifice but a complete and thoroughgoing reconstruction which shall provide a plant adequate for the services, and commensurate with the ideals, of those higher processes of community life which constitute the heart of our religion—namely, a spacious auditorium for Sunday services, forum meetings, lectures, our own dramatic productions and musical recitals, and public assemblies of the people; and a Church House, containing small auditoriums, conference rooms, offices, etc., to be used by parish organizations and such outside groups as are dedicated to the development of the higher and truer life of the community; be it therefore

Resolved, That we proceed thus to reconstruct our edifice; that we begin operations at the earliest possible moment consistent with the drawing and acceptance of satisfactory designs; that, for the sake of carrying on our public work with the minimum of interruption and inconvenience, we reconstruct first the church auditorium, and the Church House only when this auditorium has been completed and is in use; and that, for the successful conduct of these operations, we authorize the Board of Trustees to proceed at once to this work with full powers in their discretion, and with power to add from the Society at large such and so many members of its committees as it may desire; and be it further

Resolved, That this edifice, when ready for use, be rededicated to that religion which is the service of humanity; to our traditional freedom of speech; to hospitality to all men and women of the community, without regard to sect, class, nation or race; and to the usage, without fear or favor, of that spirit of communal love which shall some day bring in upon the earth the ideal society.

Read, unanimously adopted, and sanctified by the pledge of hand and heart, at a special meeting assembled on the evening of April 25, 1921.

"Einstein Simplified" Will Popularize the Theory of Relativity.

This 150-page Book, by JOHN CREWYS, contains a Chapter on

"DIETZGEN RELATIVITY"

MAILED PREPAID, ONE DOLLAR

LAWRENCE WRIGHT, 59 Fourth Avenue, NEW YORK CITY

THE WAYS OF THE GODS

By ALGERNON SIDNEY CRAPSEY

(International Press, 150 Lafayette Street, New York)

Is attracting wide and favorable notice. The New York *Herald* speaks of it as "an historical and sociological study vast in range and original in conception." The *Evening Post* says, "it is simply and intelligibly written." The Chicago *Herald-Examiner* calls it a "Flaming Book."

"The Ways of the Gods" is passing to its second printing.

BAKER AND TAYLOR COMPANY

Trade Selling Agents

354 Fourth Avenue **New York**

Price $3.00. 400 pages with list of authorities and index.
Bound in blue and silver gray. *To read it is an education.*

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

It's a "Case" of Necessity
Your Printing will be above criticism if done by
THE OAKLAND PRESS
728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Schumann & Company
Cleaners of
FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES
Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth
PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

Bowman Dairy Company
MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY
Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk
DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?
4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices
EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Subscribe for and read UNITY—
Do not miss a single number!

UNITY is a weekly paper which for forty-two years, under the editorship of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, upheld the fundamental principles of religion, political economy, and social relations; and this policy is maintained under the new editors, John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson. During the War UNITY was steadfast to the cause of righteousness and good will among the peoples of the earth. It has constantly dealt with the grave economic and political problems of Europe and the rest of the world in a straightforward unflinching manner, and it has from time to time published information of deep interest to its readers with which no other paper in the United States has dealt. It is non-sectarian. It advocates free religion and equal opportunity, as the means of uniting all peoples in the bonds of fellowship and amity. UNITY seeks to direct the minds of its readers to all that is best in the world of thought as expressed in the literature of the day, and its literary reviews are not the least valuable part of the several departments which its staff conducts from week to week. There are men and women of international renown writing for its columns and its subscribers are to be found in all the important countries of the world.

If these principles appeal to you, will you not subscribe and interest your friends?

- -

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY

700 Oakwood Boulevard Chicago, Illinois

$3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription to UNITY, or 50 cents for a ten weeks' trial subscription to UNITY. Single copies, 10 cents.

Name .....City .....

Street .....State .....